



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/524,493

06/08/2005

Mark Geach

613-93

8630

7590

03/11/2011

Dr Mark Geach
104 West Grande Avenue
Escondido, CA 92025

EXAMINER

LEITH, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/11/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10524493	6/8/2005	GEACH, MARK	613-93

Dr Mark Geach
104 West Grande Avenue
Escondido, CA 92025

EXAMINER

PATRICIA A. LEITH

ART UNIT**PAPER**

1655

20110309

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This is an addendum to the Notice of Abandonment in 10/524,493:

Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal on 7/28/2010. The only proper response after the period of response to the Final Office Action is expired and subsequent to the Notice of Appeal is the filing of an Appeal Brief. An Appeal Brief was not filed in this case within the allotted time frame. The Inventor of this case filed a response on 9/29/2010. However, at this time, the Applicant had an Attorney. Therefore, at this time although the Inventor filed a response 1) cross-communication between Inventor and Examiner is not permitted and moreover 2) even if the Examiner considered the Inventor's response considering that ex post facto, the Inventor is now a pro-se Applicant, the response was not a proper response to the Final Office action because said response was filed after the statutory time limit set for the Final Rejection. Hence, the only proper response which could have been made at that time; i.e., 6 months after the Final Rejection and after the filing of a Notice of Appeal was the filing of a proper Appeal Brief. Hence, Inventor's reply is moot and not considered and is not a proper reply and this case is Abandoned.

/PATRICIA A LEITH/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655